

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action dated February 11, 2004, the Examiner objects to the specification. Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353 (Win et al.)

By the present response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-17 remain pending in the present application.

Specification Objections

The Examiner requires amendment of disclosure to include material incorporated by reference. Applicants are confused by this requirement as Applicants could find no portion in Applicants' specification where material was incorporated by reference. All essential material is included in Applicants' specification. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a specific location in Applicants' specification justifying this requirement or withdraw this objection.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The Examiner asserts that the scope of the present invention is difficult to ascertain and specifically points to the limitations in claims 1 and 9 that begin "means for controlling operation indicated by said access request. . . ". Applicants have

amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn. Applicants provide the following to aid in the Examiner's further understanding of the present invention.

Initially, the term "access privilege to integrated data containing virtual tables constituted by the real tables" simply means that virtual tables that may exist in software and not actual physical storage, may contain mapping information that maps access to integrated data to actual physical storage devices, i.e. real tables. Therefore, virtual tables may reside only in software whereas real tables may reside or represent actual physical storage.

The limitations in the claims of the present invention relate to providing information which correlates an access privilege for operating an integrated database (referred to as "virtual tables" in the specification, page 6, lines 19-20) and an access privilege for accessing a before-integrated individual database (referred to as "real tables" in the specification, page 6, lines 21-22) to match each other in integrating a plurality of databases. With this information, the content of access privilege created in creating the virtual table can be matched with the content of access privilege previously created in the real table. Therefore, while still maintaining an environment prior to integration of the databases, a newly integrated database (virtual table) can be used.

For example, if a user name "A" who has accessed a before-integrated database needs to access an after-integrated database by using a user name "B", information regarding access privilege to the before-integrated database need not be

changed from "A" to "B" since this invention correlates information "A" with "B".

Therefore, a user can access a portion of the after-integrated database using the user name "A" that is the before-integrated database included in the after-integrated database using the same user name "A" or the user name "B". Therefore, information regarding both access privileges can be united.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. Applicants reassert all arguments submitted traversing these rejections filed in Applicants' previously-filed response. Applicants provide the following additional remarks.

Win et al. merely discloses controlling access by a user to one or more Web resources stored on a Web server. A user is authorized access based on stored information describing one or more roles and one or more access rights of the user, stored in association with user identifying information. Win et al. discloses storing in a database information describing a role of the user and other user related information. Win et al. does not disclose or suggest anything related to a multi-database processing apparatus for performing an integration processing to data stored in a plurality of database apparatuses, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner asserts that Win et al. discloses a multi-database in which a plurality of database apparatuses each store data by protective resource 208 of Fig. 2. However, protected resource 208 is merely resources that are stored by protected server 104 (see col. 7, lines 34-35). This is not a database at all but

1
2 represents the resources that a user may desire access to. The Examiner further
3 asserts that Win et al. discloses a multi-database processing apparatus for
4 performing an integration processing to data by access server 106 per Fig. 1 and
5 col. 6, lines 40-54. However, access server 106 is simply a single server. Access
6 server 106 is not a database, and is not a multi-database processing apparatus.
7 Access server 106 is merely a server used to authenticate a user. This is not a
8 database, a multi-database processing apparatus, nor does this perform an
9 integration processing to data stored in a plurality of database apparatuses, as
10 recited in the claims of the present application.

11 The Examiner further asserts that Win et al. discloses means for receiving a
12 plurality of dispersed data from a plurality of database apparatuses based on a
13 request for integrating data from a user processing apparatus, by the browser 100 of
14 Fig. 1 and col. 5, lines 1-12 of Win et al. Browser 100 and the cited portion of
15 Win et al. merely disclose a simple computer browser, and as disclosed in Win et al.
16 that represents a terminal workstation computer, etc., that executes a standard Web
17 browser program or an equivalent. This portion of Win et al. does not disclose or
18 suggest anything related to receiving a plurality of dispersed data from a plurality of
19 database apparatuses, or a request for integrating data from a user processing
20 apparatus, as recited in the claims of the present application. Browser 100 is a
21 simple browser as is fully disclosed in Win et al.

22 The Examiner further asserts that Win et al. discloses means for integrating a
23 plurality of received dispersed data to generate integrated data dynamically, by the

disclosure in Win et al. of a single secure login to Web resources, per col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 9. However, entering a name and password to a login screen on a Web browser does not disclose or suggest anything related to integrating a plurality of received dispersed data or anything related to generating integrated data dynamically. This disclosure in Win et al. has nothing to do with these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Applicants have pointed out some of several deficiencies in the Examiner's assertion that Win et al. discloses the limitations in the claims of the present application. As noted previously, Win et al. is directed simply to authentication of a user to access stored resources. In contrast, the claims of the present application are directed to providing information that correlates an access privilege for operating an integrated database and an access privilege for accessing a before-integrated individual database to match with each other in integrating a plurality of databases. Win et al. and the claims of the present application are clearly directed at two totally separate and distinct inventions.

Moreover, Applicants submit that Win et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the claims of each of claims 1 and 9 of, inter alia, dispersed data access privilege correlating dispersed data identification information for identifying a first user name permitted to access the dispersed data, or an integrated access privilege correlating integrated data information identifying a second user name permitted to access integrated data where the first user name and the second user name represent a same user. Moreover, Win et al. does not disclose or suggest

2 means for receiving an access request for an operation on a portion of the integrated
3 data, the portion being the dispersed data, or means for controlling the operation
4 indicated by the access request applied to the plurality of dispersed data included in
5 the integrated data using a corresponding relationship between the dispersed data
6 access privilege and the integrated data access privilege, where the corresponding
7 relationship allows the user to access the dispersed data included in the integrated
8 data using either the first user name or the second user name. Win et al. simply
9 relates to receiving a request from a user to access resources, determining if the
10 user is allowed to access these resources, and presenting the user with a Web page
11 showing only those resources that the user may access. Win et al. does not disclose
12 or suggest anything related to a multi-database system, multi-database processing
13 apparatus for performing an integration processing, a first user name permitted to
14 access dispersed data, a second user name permitted to access integrated data, a
15 corresponding relationship between dispersed data access privilege and integrated
16 data access privilege, or any of the other limitations in the claims of the present
17 application. The Examiner fails to point out specifically, among other things, where
18 multiple databases exist in Win et al. or where any integration of the data in the
19 multiple databases occurs in Win et al.

20 The Examiner states that Applicants' access privilege corresponding to data
21 of a dispersed database is interpreted as "a network resource connected to a
22 network and having a list concerning an individual access" and that the access
23 privilege to an integrated database is interpreted as "an access privilege to a Web

2 resource stored in a Web server" as disclosed in Win et al. These interpretations are
3 incorrect and not supported by any disclosure in Win et al. Even if these
4 interpretations are correct (which they are not) Win et al. does not disclose or
5 suggest correlating access privileges with each other, as recited in the claims of the
6 present application. Win et al. uses a name of a user using a Web server as a
united key for access privilege. Information about access privilege to each network
resource constituting a Web resource is made to coincide with information about
access privilege to the Web resource. Therefore, even combining Win et al. with
Win background, if information about access privilege to each network resource
constituting the Web resource were present before creating a Web resource, the
Web resource is created by creating information of access privilege concerning the
Web resource using information concerning an access privilege already existing (that
is, if information on the already-existing access privilege is "A" the Web resource
side is set to "A"). If a new access privilege is set in the Web resource and the
information on already existing, access privilege is changed to a new access
privilege (for example, if "B" is set to the Web resource, the information "A"
concerning the already set access privilege to changed to "B"). These changes are
very troublesome and potentially cause erroneous user operation. The limitations in
the claims of the present application prevents such a change from occurring by
correlating both access privileges based on a correspondence relation. These
limitations are not disclosed, suggested or rendered obvious by the cited references,
taken alone or in any proper combination.

Regarding claims 2-8 and 10-17, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 9 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims. For example, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose or suggest the operation contents indicated by the dispersed data operating rights including at least one of insert, select, change, and copy of the dispersed data, or where the change of the integrated data includes at least one of update, substitute, and delete of the integrated data and addition of data to the integrated data.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-17 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-17 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

U.S. Application No. 09/803,149

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.39846X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

FDB/sdb
(703) 312-6600